been telling us for 2 years, and acting on it.

This is no small thing. Old habits are not easy to break, but sometimes they must be. And now is such a time. With a $14 trillion debt and an administration that talks about cost-cutting but then sends over a budget that triples the national debt in 10 years and creates a massive new entitlement program, it is time for some of us in Washington to show in every way possible that we mean what we say about spending.

With Republican leaders in Congress united, the attention now turns to the President. We have said we are willing to give up discretion; now we will see how he handles spending decisions.

And if the President ends up with total discretion over spending, we will see even more clearly where his priorities lie. We already saw the administration's priorities in a stimulus bill that has become synonymous with wasteful spending, that borrowed nearly $1 trillion for administration earmarks like turtle tunnels, a sidewalk that lead to a ditch, and research on voter perceptions of the bill.

Congressional Republicans uncovered much of this waste. Through congressional oversight, we will continue to monitor how the money taxpayers send to the administration is actually spent. It is now up to the President and his party leaders in Congress to show their own seriousness on this issue, to say whether they will join Republican leaders in this effort and then, after that, in significantly reducing the size and cost and reach of government. The people have spoken. They have said as clearly as they can that this is what they want us to do.

They will be watching.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There will now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. SPECTER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAMEDUCK SESSION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to discuss the activities of the so-called lameduck session we are about to enter. I begin by suggesting that our session does not necessarily have to be a lameduck. We have the capacity to respond to the many pressing problems of the country as we choose. We can spread our wings and we can fly. One could say at many points during the course of the 111th Congress, the session could be called a turkey. It has not been very active in many respects. This body, not atypical, has been expert at avoiding tough votes. Well, if there is any time where it is easiest to avoid tough votes, it is a long distance from the next election, and we can't get any further from the next election than today, since the last election was only 13 days ago.

It is my suggestion that this would be a good time to undertake some significant action. The country is in a tremendous state of turmoil politically, I think more so than at any time in the country's history, certainly more than at any time during my tenure in the Senate; I think beyond that, at any time in the history of the country with the exception of the Civil War period. We have seen candidates run on a platform of ''I won't compromise.''

This is a political body. The art of politics is compromise and accommodation. I suggest there are some real lessons we all learned 13 days ago from the election which we ought to put into effect now and take some action and some decisive action. I suggest a good place to start would be the enactment of the so-called DISCLOSE Act. That is the legislation which would, at a minimum, require the identity of contributors be known to the public so their motivations can be evaluated.

Campaign finance reform followed the massive cash contributions going back to the 1972 elections, and the Congress passed reform legislation in 1974. Then, in a landmark decision, Buckley v. Valeo, in 1976, key parts of that legislation were declared unconstitutional. Freedom of speech under the first amendment was equated with money. I agree with Justice Stevens that that was a classic mistake; that the principle of one person one vote is vitiated by allowing the powerful, the rich to have such a large megaphone that it drowns out virtually everybody else.

There have been a series of legislative enactments to try to overcome the restrictions of Buckley v. Valeo and a corresponding series of Supreme Court decisions broadening the field of freedom of speech, until we got to the case of Citizens United. Then, upsetting 100 years of precedent, the Supreme Court decided corporations and unions could advertise in political campaigns and, in conjunction with other loopholes in the campaign law, it was possible those contributions could be made secretly. When the bill was called for a motion to proceed, as we all know, it fell short of the 60 votes necessary to cut off debate or to impose cloture. Fifty-nine Senators voted aye that we wanted to proceed, 57 Democrats and 2 Independents and all 41 Republicans voted no.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article by Richard Polman in the Philadelphia Enquirer and an editorial from the New York Times on the DISCLOSE Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. The Polman article recites a number of Senators who voted no against proceeding with the DISCLOSE Act, having made in the past very forceful affirmative statements in favor of disclosure. It may be that by reminding those 4 Senators, perhaps 1 of them or 2 of them—we only need 1, if the 59 votes hold—they could be persuaded to vote aye and proceed to consider the bill. Then we have the advocates of McCain-Feingold. If we compare the rollcall vote on McCain-Feingold, we find there are a number of Senators who voted no against taking up the DISCLOSE Act, Senators who previously had spoken out forcefully in favor of finance limitations and in favor of transparency. Perhaps at least one of those or perhaps even more could be persuaded to vote to proceed with the so-called DISCLOSE Act.

There has been a plethora of political commentary about the dangers to our political system by having anonymous campaign contributions. The last election was inundated with money, and the forecasts are that the next election will be even more decisively controlled by these large contributions and by these anonymous contributions. So to preserve our democracy and to preserve the power of the individual contrasted with the power of the wealthy, I believe that ought to be very high on our agenda.

There is a corollary to the need for some change, some reform as a result of what happened in Citizens United. In that case, we had two votes, and they were decisive. To make the five-person majority, two votes totally reversed the positions which those Justices had taken not too long ago during their confirmation proceedings. Chief Justice Roberts was emphatic in his confirmation proceeding that he was not going to jolt the system, that he would have respect for stare decisis, and that he would have respect for congressional findings. So was Justice Alito on both those accounts. In their confirmation hearings, the testimony of both was explicit in the statement that it was a legislative function to find the facts, and it was not a judicial function to find the facts. When Citizens United came down, as the dissenting opinion by Justice Stevens pointed out, a voluminous factual record showing the dangers and the potential dangers of excessive contributions was on the record.

All that was ignored in the decision in Citizens United and was ignored by